

Before the
COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES
Washington, DC

<i>In re</i>	
DISTRIBUTION OF CABLE ROYALTY FUNDS	Docket No. 16-CRB-0009-CD (2014-2017)
DISTRIBUTION OF SATELLITE ROYALTY FUNDS	Docket No. 16-CRB-0010-SD (2014-2017)

**SETTLING DEVOTIONAL CLAIMANTS' MOTION TO COMPEL MULTIGROUP
CLAIMANTS TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS**

The Settling Devotional Claimants (“SDC”) hereby move to compel Multigroup Claimants to produce documents responsive to the SDC’s document production requests served on January 28, 2022. In particular, the SDC seek complete responses to request 10 (for documents sufficient to show which stations carried programs claimed on behalf of Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.) and requests 27, 30, 31, and 32 (for documents relating to Multigroup Claimants’ authority to file and apparent failure to file claims for royalty year 2014). Multigroup Claimants’ Responses of February 18, 2022, to the SDC’s Requests (which repeat each request followed by the response) are attached to this Motion as Exhibit A.

I. Procedural Background

In the Judges’ Order for Further Proceedings and Scheduling Case Events, entered on January 10, 2022, pursuant to the Judges’ authority under 17 U.S.C. § 801(c), the Judges ordered “early disclosure and discovery to aid the participants in resolving both satellite and cable claims issues,” and they set a schedule for discovery relating to claims validity disputes. The Judges ordered “participants involved in controversies involving the validity or categorization of claims to disclose to all other participants, whether or not they believe the other participants have a

specific interest in the claims controversies 1) their authority to represent each claimant, 2) program information for each claimant (e.g., correct title for each claimed program and other identifying information in cases in which titles may be confused), and 3) a clear statement, by royalty year, of each claim against the royalty fund and the claimant categories in which the asserted claim belongs.” The Judges set a deadline of March 16, 2022, to end disclosure and discovery regarding claims disputes.

Pursuant to a more refined discovery schedule agreed amongst the parties, the SDC served document production requests relating to claims validity and categorization on Multigroup Claimants on January 28, 2022. Multigroup Claimants served its written responses and objections on February 18, 2022, and it produced documents in response to some, but not all, of the SDC’s requests. Essentially all of the documents produced by Multigroup Claimants had been previously produced in earlier proceedings.

Multigroup Claimants refused to produce documents in response to, among others, the SDC’s request 10, for documents sufficient to show which stations carried programs claimed on behalf of Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc., and the SDC’s requests 27, 30, 31, and 32, for documents relating to Multigroup Claimants’ authority to file and apparent failure to file claims for royalty year 2014. In an email exchange on February 23, 2022, counsel for the SDC requested Multigroup Claimants’ counsel to produce documents focused specifically on these requests. Multigroup Claimants’ counsel refused the SDC’s counsel request.

II. Document Production Requested

a. Documents Relating to Programs Claimed by Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.

The SDC’s request 10 seeks documents sufficient to show which stations carried programs claimed on behalf of Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc. The reason for this

request is simple: There appears to be more than one producer of television programs with titles similar to “Salem Baptist Church,” “Salem Baptist,” “Salem Church,” “New Salem Baptist Church,” and “New Salem Church,” claimed by Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.:

45	James T. Meeks	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
46	New Salem Baptist Church	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
47	New Salem Church	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
48	Reverend Meeks	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
49	Salem Baptist	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
50	Salem Baptist Church	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
51	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.
52	Salem Church	DEVOTIONAL	Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.

For example, the SDC believe that the program “New Salem Baptist Church” broadcast in some years by WMC and WLMT, in Memphis, Tennessee, appears to be associated with New Salem Baptist Church in Memphis, <https://www.newsalembaptist.com/>, rather than with Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc. (which does not contain the word “New,” in its name and has no presence in the Memphis area). There are other churches with similar names in other communities. The easiest way to resolve this question is to determine where Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc.’s programs are broadcast, which should be easy for Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc. to provide.

Information about the stations on which Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc. has broadcast its programs will assist the SDC in determining which retransmissions are claimed in this proceeding and whether other programs with similar names are unclaimed. The SDC’s request is well within the scope of the Judges’ order to provide “correct title for each claimed program *and other identifying information in cases in which titles may be confused.*” Order for Further Proceedings and Scheduling Case Events (Jan. 10, 2022) (emphasis added).

b. Documents Relating to Multigroup Claimants' Authority to File and Apparent Failure to File Claims for Royalty Year 2014.

The second category of documents relates to the question of whether “Multigroup Claimants” was an authorized “designated agent” to file claims for royalty years 2015, 2016, and 2017, as required by the Copyright Act. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 111(d)(4)(B). Multigroup Claimants’ claims for these royalty years present a unique confluence of circumstances that to the SDC’s knowledge is unprecedented in copyright royalty proceedings. The entire claimant group formerly represented by Worldwide Subsidy Group, LLC, consisting of approximately 87 claimants, failed to file any claim for royalty year 2014, raising the question as to – who if anybody – was authorized to file claims for that year, and whether Worldwide Subsidy Group’s authority had been terminated as of 2014. For royalty year 2015, royalty claims were filed for the first time by “Multigroup Claimants,” which was then an assumed business name of Alfred Galaz, the father of Worldwide Subsidy Group’s founder, Raul Galaz. Multigroup Claimants asserts in these proceedings that “*all* of the represented copyright claimants have been represented vis-à-vis agreements entered into with WSG.” MC Replies in Support of Motion for Partial Distribution of 2015-17 Cable & Satellite Royalties, Dkt. Nos. 16-CRB-0009-CD & 16-CRB-0010-SD, at 2 (Aug. 13, 2021).

In the 2010-13 proceedings, the Judges found that Alfred Galaz, under the name “Multigroup Claimants,” was authorized to proceed on 2010-13 claims that had previously been filed by Worldwide Subsidy Group, finding that Worldwide Subsidy Group had assigned its agency agreements to Alfred Galaz.¹ Nevertheless, the Judges denied “Multigroup Claimants” a

¹ It is the SDC’s understanding based on Multigroup Claimants’ representations in the 2010-13 cable and satellite proceedings that, following a series of purported inter-family conveyances, “Multigroup Claimants” became an assumed business name of Worldwide Subsidy Group in January, 2020. But the 2015 and 2016 claims at issue in these proceedings, and possibly the 2017 claims in these proceedings, were filed by “Multigroup Claimants” as an assumed business name of Alfred Galaz or his grandson, Ryan Galaz.

presumption of validity of its claims, in part because the Judges found that the purpose of the purported assignment to Alfred Galaz was, “at least in part, to evade the effect of the Judges’ prior rulings concerning the application of the presumption of validity to IPG’s claims.” Ruling and Order Regarding Objections to Cable and Satellite Claims, 14-CRB-0010-CD/SD (2010-13) (Oct. 23, 2017) at 7-9 (“Ruling on Claims”). The Judges have yet to address whether Alfred Galaz had the authority to file claims for 2015-17 when those claims were filed.

There is particular reason to doubt Alfred Galaz’s authority to file claims for 2015-17, when neither he nor Worldwide Subsidy Group filed any claims at all for royalty year 2014. The apparent failure to file any claim for 2014 (due in July, 2015), coupled with the abrupt purported transfer of agency authority from Worldwide Subsidy Group to Alfred Galaz on January 20, 2015, raise a significant question as to whether Alfred Galaz or his purported successors in interest had authority to file claims for 2015, 2016, and 2017.

The natural question raised by the gap in 2014 is whether Alfred Galaz was not authorized to file claims in 2014 (because why else would he not have filed them?). And if Alfred Galaz was not authorized to file claims for 2014, then the question becomes how he or his successors obtained authority to file for 2015 through 2017.

Multigroup Claimants has produced Worldwide Subsidy Group’s agency agreements and acknowledgments of representation pre-dating the purported conveyance of authority to Alfred Galaz on January 20, 2015, and it has produced instruments purporting to assign authority from Worldwide Subsidy Group to Alfred Galaz and from Alfred Galaz to his grandson, Ryan Galaz, but it has produced no documents from any Devotional claimants consenting to the transfer of agency authority, as required by California law. Cal. Civ. Code § 2349 (prohibiting delegation of agency powers except in certain circumstances, including authorization by the principal). Nor

has Multigroup Claimants produced any communications with its represented claimants suggesting that they were even aware of the purported transfer of authority, or documents that would tend to explain why no claims were filed for 2014. If Multigroup Claimants was in fact an authorized agent for the filing of claims for 2014, then such communications would necessarily exist, because the failure to file 2014 claims would be a clear breach of its fiduciary duties to its principals, which no responsible “designated agent” would conceal from its represented claimants. If, on the other hand, Multigroup Claimants lacked authority to file claims for 2014, then there is no explanation as to how it gained authority to file claims for 2015, 2016, or 2017. Discovery will help clarify whether authority was terminated before the 2014 claims filing deadline or was lacking due to claimants not consenting to an assignment to Alfred Galaz; whether authority was terminated in response to the failure to file in 2014; and whether claimants confirmed their consent to continued representation following the failure to file in 2014.

While the SDC raised Multigroup Claimants’ failure to file the 2014 claims as a concern in the 2010-2013 proceeding, the Judges determined that MGC’s filing or non-filing of 2014 claims did not bear on the question whether MGC was authorized to participate in the 2010-2013 proceeding. Ruling on Claims at 5. However, that is not the case in this proceeding, which is specifically directed to the 2014 claim year. Simply stated, the SDC cannot answer the questions raised by Multigroup Claimants’ failure to file 2014 claims without discovery that is solely in the possession of Multigroup Claimants or its represented claimants. Accordingly, the Judges should compel Multigroup Claimants to produce documents relating to these events and issues. This inquiry in discovery is along lines very similar to what the Judges granted in the 2010-13 royalty proceedings:

In past distribution proceedings, a principal of IPG (MGC's putative predecessor), Raul Galaz, engaged in criminal and fraudulent behavior in connection with the acquisition of royalties, and entities in which Mr. Galaz had an interest engaged in questionable conduct in filing claims on behalf of purported claimants. ... This one paragraph document [the assignment of authority from Worldwide Subsidy Group to Alfred Galaz], signed by Denise Vernon, (Raul Galaz's sister), on behalf of IPG and Alfredo Galaz, (Raul Galaz's father) on behalf of MGC, raises questions that concern distribution of the Devotional Programming category funds. Broadly, these questions relate, inter alia, to whether a sufficient connection exists between MGC and IPG or Mr. Galaz for the Judges to apply the same evidentiary conditions on MGC as they have on IPG in prior distribution proceedings, as well as any other conditions that might be appropriate. The SDC are entitled to this inquiry.

Order Granting in Part Settling Devotional Claimants' Motion to Compel Production by Multigroup Claimants, No. 14-CRB-0010-CD (2010-13) at 3. In this proceeding, because of the lack of any claim for 2014 and the apparent failure to obtain authorization from the claimants for any assignment to Alfred Galaz or his successors, there is additional reason to question Multigroup Claimants' authority and the validity of the claims it filed.

III. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the SDC request the Judges to grant their motion to compel.

/s/ Michael Warley

Matthew J. MacLean (DC Bar No. 479257)
Michael A. Warley (DC Bar No. 1028686)
Jessica T. Nyman (DC Bar No. 1030613)
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1200 17th St. NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 663-8000
Facsimile: (202) 663-8007
matthew.macleam@pillsburylaw.com
michael.warley@pillsburylaw.com
jessica.nyman@pillsburylaw.com

Arnold P. Lutzker, Esq. (DC Bar No. 108106)
Benjamin Sternberg (DC Bar No. 1016576)
LUTZKER & LUTZKER LLP
1233 20th St. NW, Suite 703

Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 408-7600
Fax: (202) 408-7677
arnie@lutzker.com
ben@lutzker.com

Counsel for Settling Devotional Claimants

Exhibit A

Pick & Boydston, LLP
732 West 9th Street, Suite 103
San Pedro, CA 90731
Telephone (310)987-2414

February 18, 2022

E-Mail: Matthew.MacLean@PillsburyLaw.com
E-Mail: arnie@lutzker.com

SETTLING DEVOTIONAL CLAIMANTS

Matthew J. MacLean
Michael Warley
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 57197
Washington, D.C. 20036-9997

Arnold P. Lutzker
Benjamin Sternberg
LUTZKER & LUTZKER LLP
1233 20th Street, NW, Suite 703
Washington, DC 20036

**Re: *Docket Nos. 16-CRB-0009-CD (2014-2017), 16-CRB-0010-SD (2014-2017);
Distribution of the 2014-2017 Cable and Satellite Royalty Funds; Multigroup
Claimants' Document Discovery Requests on Claims Issues***

Dear Sir/Madam:

On behalf of Multigroup Claimants ("MC"), the following are the responses to the discovery requests and follow-up discovery requests propounded by the Settling Devotional Claimants, dated January 28, 2022.

General Objections

MC will respond to the requests to the best of its ability; however, with respect to each of the requests, MC states the following General Objections:

- 1) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they are vague, ambiguous, or otherwise not susceptible to a response, and to the extent that they are overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seek the disclosure of documents and information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of evidence admissible in this proceeding.
- 2) MC objects to these requests to the extent they call for the disclosure of information that is confidential to MC and/or third parties. Any information identified as "confidential"

shall be subject to a General Protective Order proposed to the Copyright Royalty Judges for this proceeding.

- 3) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they seek disclosure of documents and information that is not subject to discovery pursuant to the regulations applicable to the Copyright Royalty Board, set forth at 37 C.F.R. Section 301.1, et seq.
- 4) MC objects to these requests to the extent that the definitions and instructions purport to impose obligations beyond those imposed by the regulations of the Copyright Royalty Board.
- 5) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they seek the disclosure of information and documents protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or the attorney work product doctrine.
- 6) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they seek the disclosure of information and documents not within MC's possession, custody, or control.
- 7) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they seek the disclosure of information unrelated to these proceedings.
- 8) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they seek information in a form or format not regularly kept in the normal course of business.
- 9) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they request the preparation of documents that do not exist.
- 10) MC objects to these requests to the extent that they call for either responses or the production of documents in a format beyond what is required by the Copyright Royalty Board regulations, or in a format with which the responding party did not cooperate with MC, e.g., repeating each of the requests.
- 11) MC simultaneously served document requests on the propounding party herein. MC objects to these requests to the extent that they seek documents similarly requested by MC but to which the propounding party objects and will refuse to produce documents. Absent an order of the Copyright Royalty Board requiring reciprocal disclosure and production, MC will not produce such documents.
- 12) According to the January 10, 2022 order of the Judges, "Disclosures must not include duplicate claims or claims for a single program in more than one category." In many cases, complying with such order will deny a claimant comprehensive royalties for their program, if such program qualifies for placement in multiple categories according to the category definitions adopted by the Judges in their order of April 5, 2021. For example, non-U.S. producer programming qualifies for placement in the Canadian Claimants category to the extent that qualifying compensable broadcasts originate in Canada, while also qualifying in the Program Suppliers category to the extent that qualifying broadcasts originate in the U.S. Consequently, the nationality of the claimant, coupled with the origination of qualifying broadcast, dictate whether only one or multiple categories apply

to program compensation in such situation. While not currently relevant, placement in both the non-commercial programming category and Program Suppliers category similarly occurs. MC has endeavored to clarify when this circumstance occurs, and interprets the Judges' order to prohibit placement of a program in multiple categories based on its content only (e.g., sports vs. entertainment vs. devotional).

Specific Objections

1. Provide all information required by the CRB's January 10, 2022 Order, including "1) [Your] authority to represent each claimant, 2) program information for each claimant (e.g., correct title information for each claimed program and other identifying information in cases in which titles may be confused), and 3) a clear statement, by royalty year, of each claim against the royalty fund and the claimant categories in which the asserted claim belongs. Disclosures must not include duplicate claims or claims for a single program in more than one category."
2. Produce all documents relating to the information sought in Request No. 1 and the CRB's January 10, 2022 Order.

Response to Request No. 2: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request for information is ambiguous and overbroad to the extent that it seeks documents above and beyond the documents identified in the CRB's January 10, 2022 Order.

3. For every MC Devotional Claimant, identify every program title for each program in Your Claims in these Proceedings, as well as other identifying information in cases in which titles may be confused, stating the applicable years (2014 through 2017) and proceedings (cable or satellite) for each, and produce documents sufficient to identify the same.
4. Identify every program or program title in Your Claims on behalf of an MC Devotional Claimant, that is also claimed by any other Claimant in these Proceedings.
5. Identify every MC Devotional Claimant, stating the applicable years (2014 through 2017) and proceedings (cable or satellite) for each, and produce documents sufficient to identify every MC Devotional Claimant and the years and proceedings in which You assert Claims on their behalf.

Response to Request No. 5: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1.

6. Produce documents sufficient to identify the ultimate recipient of any royalties You collect in these proceedings for every MC Devotional Claimant.

Response to Request No. 6: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1.

7. For every MC Devotional Claimant, identify every program claimed in the Devotional Category in these Proceedings, stating the applicable years (2014 through 2017) and

proceedings (cable or satellite) for each, and produce documents sufficient to identify every program in Your Claims in these Proceedings for each year, proceeding, and MC Devotional Claimant.

Response to Request No. 7: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1.

8. If any MC Devotional Claimant claims the same program as any other Claimant (including any other MC Devotional Claimant), provide all documents relating to any communications or written agreements between or among those Claimants and/or You relating to the Authority to file Claims for those programs or program titles.

Response to Request No. 8: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1. MC further objects to the request on the grounds that the request is overbroad to the extent that the request seeks "any communications" between a particular claimant and MC.

9. Produce documents sufficient to show the stations which carried every program You claim in the Devotional Category in each year of these Proceedings.

Response to Request No. 9: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant as beyond the scope of the discovery required by the January 10, 2022 order relating to "claims issues".

10. Produce documents sufficient to show the stations which carried programs in Your Claims on behalf of Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Inc. that You claim in the Devotional Category in each year of these Proceedings.

Response to Request No. 10: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant as beyond the scope of the discovery required by the January 10, 2022 order relating to "claims issues".

11. For every program claimed by any MC Devotional Claimant in the Devotional Category that is also claimed by any other Claimant in any other Category (or has the same name as such a program), produce documents sufficient to identify the program broadcasts in Your Claims in the Devotional Category.

Response to Request No. 11: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1.

12. For each MC Devotional Claimant, produce all documents relating to or underlying the categorization or potential categorization of any programs in Your Claims for these Proceedings in the Devotional Category as devotional programs, for any programs that the CRB has not previously determined was properly categorized in the Devotional Category in a final determination in a prior CRB proceeding.

13. Produce all documents that undermine the categorization as Devotional of any programs in Your Claims that You seek in the Devotional Category.
14. If You or any MC Devotional Claimant claims any program in both the Devotional Category and any other category, identify such program, and produce all documents underlying or relating to the basis for claiming the program in the Devotional Category claim and for claiming the program in the other category.
15. For MC Devotional Claimants with programs claimed in both the Devotional and Program Suppliers categories (including at least the following: IWV Media Group, Inc.; K2 Media Group; Promark Television, Inc.; and Worldwide Subsidy Group LLC), produce documents sufficient to show the ultimate producers, distributors, and copyright owners of any programs claimed in the Devotional Category.

Response to Request No. 15: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1. MC objects to the request on the grounds that the "presumption of validity" afforded to claimants includes the claimant's claim of ownership or entitlement to make claim for the program, and such claimant's categorization of their program. Notwithstanding the foregoing, MC has no documents in its possession or of which it is aware that contradict the claimant's claim of ownership or entitlement to make claim, or the claimant's categorization of their program in any particular category.

16. For MC Devotional Claimants with programs claimed in both the Devotional and Program Suppliers categories (including at least the following: IWV Media Group, Inc.; K2 Media Group; Promark Television, Inc.; and Worldwide Subsidy Group LLC), produce documents sufficient to show the programs claimed in the Devotional Category are devotional programs.

Response to Request No. 16: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1. MC objects to the request on the grounds that the "presumption of validity" afforded to claimants includes the claimant's claim of ownership or entitlement to make claim for the program, and such claimant's categorization of their program. Notwithstanding the foregoing, MC has no documents in its possession or of which it is aware that contradict the claimant's claim of ownership or entitlement to make claim, or the claimant's categorization of their program in any particular category.

17. For MC Devotional Claimants with programs in both the Devotional and Program Suppliers categories (including at least the following: IWV Media Group, Inc.; K2 Media Group; Promark Television, Inc.; and Worldwide Subsidy Group LLC), produce all documents relating to Your Authority to file Claims for the programs in Your Claims in the Devotional Category, including all documents and communications with any entity relating to the Your Authority to file Claims in these Proceedings for these programs or Claimants.

Response to Request No. 17: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is, in part, redundant of Request no. 1. To the extent that the request seeks “all” communications with a represented claimant, the request is overbroad.

18. Produce all documents relating to Your Authority to file Claims for every MC Devotional Claimant.

Response to Request No. 18: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1.

19. Produce all documents that may tend to undermine the basis for Your Authority to file Claims on behalf of any MC Devotional Claimant.
20. Produce all communications with any MC Devotional Claimant relating to these Proceedings or the Claims filed in the Proceedings on their behalf.

Response to Request No. 20: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request for information is ambiguous and overbroad. To the extent that the request seeks “all” communications with a represented claimant relating to these proceedings, the request is overbroad.

21. Produce every agreement between every MC Devotional Claimant and WSG, and all documents relating to or underlying Your claim that “all of the represented copyright claimants have been represented vis-a-vis agreements entered into with WSG.” MC Replies in Support of Motions for Partial Distribution, filed Aug. 13, 2021.

Response to Request No. 21: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 1.

22. Produce all agreements between every MC Devotional Claimants and You and any of Your affiliates, principals, shareholders, agents, alter-egos, predecessors, or owners, including Ryan Galaz, Alfred Galaz, Raul Galaz, Ruth Galaz, and Denise Vernon, Spanish Language Producers, IPG, and/or WSG, including all communications and documents relating to the terms, duration, and possible changes to such agreements.

Response to Request No. 22: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request, in part, is redundant of Request no. 1. MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is, in part, beyond the scope of the discovery required by the January 10, 2022 order relating to “claims issues”, to the extent that it seeks agreements with persons that are neither claimants nor participants in these proceedings, nor predecessors in interest, including Ryan Galaz, Alfred Galaz, Raul Galaz, Ruth Galaz, or Denise Vernon.

23. Produce all documents relating to any dispute, disagreement, misunderstanding, or confusion relating to Your Authority to file Claims, including communications and agreements with any MC Devotional Claimant relating to Claims in any year.

Response to Request No. 23: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request for information is ambiguous and overbroad.

24. Produce all documents and communications relating to any assignment, transfer, sale, revocation, suspensions, expiration, limitation, condition, modification, termination, attempted termination, rescission, disavowal, or other change relating to the Authority to file Claims for any MC Devotional Claimant, whether such change was relating to Your Authority to file Claims or to the Authority to file Claims of any other entity whatsoever.

Response to Request No. 24: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no. 19. MC objects to the request, in part, on the grounds that such request for information is ambiguous and overbroad, to the extent that it seeks information relating to “any other entity whatsoever”, including but not limited to parties that either are not making claim for programming in the devotional programming category, or not making claim in these proceedings.

25. Produce all documents and communications relating to any assignment, transfer, sale, revocation, suspensions, limitation, condition, modification, termination, attempted termination, rescission, disavowal, or other change relating to Your Authority to file Claims on behalf of any MC Devotional Claimant in prior or future royalty years, even if even if You contend that such action or change was invalid, does not apply to these Proceedings, or was rescinded, revoked, or overridden by subsequent actions or events (and produce all documents relating to any such subsequent actions or events).

Response to Request No. 25: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request nos. 1, 19, and 24.

26. Identify the date on which Your Authority to file Claims for every MC Devotional Claimant was acquired or the intention for You to file Claims by the Claimant was expressed prior to filing Claims in these Proceedings, and produce all documents reflecting or relating to the date when Your Authority to file Claims for every MC Devotional Claimant was acquired or affirmed by the Claimant.

Response to Request No. 26: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is, in part, redundant of Request no 1. MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is, in part, overbroad, to the extent that it requests “all documents reflecting or relating to”

27. Produce all documents relating to Your Authority to file Claims in these Proceedings, or lack thereof, for 2014 royalties on behalf of any MC Devotional Claimant.

Response to Request No. 27: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant, as MC has made no claim relating to 2014 royalties. MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is overbroad, to the extent that it requests “all documents”

28. Produce all documents relating to the “time the agreement was executed” (as that phrase is used in Exhibit A to MC’s Petition to Participate in 2014-17 Cable Proceedings) for

MC to represent each MC Devotional Claimants, including all documents and communications arising after the “time the agreement was executed” relating to your Authority to file Claims on behalf of an MC Devotional Claimant.

Response to Request No. 28: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request nos. 1, 19, and 24. MC objects to the request, in part, on the grounds that such request for information is overbroad, to the extent that it seeks information relating to “all documents and communications arising after”

29. Produce all documents relating to any partial assignment of rights or Authority to file Claims to MC for less than the entire 2014-2017 period covered by these Proceedings, including all documents underlying or relating to the statement in MC’s Petitions to Participate in these Proceedings that “certain of the parties assigned rights to MC, or made independent claims, for less than the aggregate of 2015-2017 calendar years.”

Response to Request No. 29: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request no 1.

30. Produce all communications with any MC Devotional Claimant relating to Claims in these Proceedings for the year 2014.

Response to Request No. 30: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant, as MC has made no claim relating to 2014 royalties. MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is overbroad, to the extent that it requests “all communications”

31. Produce all communications with any MC Devotional Claimant discussing the lack of Claims filed by You for that Claimant’s programming in these Proceedings for the 2014 royalty year.

Response to Request No. 31: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant, as MC has made no claim relating to 2014 royalties. MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is overbroad, to the extent that it requests “all communications”

32. Produce all agreements or documents relating to any indemnity, rights or obligations between You and any MC Devotional Claimant relating to copyright royalties for the year 2014.

Response to Request No. 32: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant, as MC has made no claim relating to 2014 royalties. MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is overbroad, to the extent that it requests “all agreements or documents”

33. Produce all documents relating to every MC Devotional Claimant’s grant to any person or entity whatsoever of Authority to file Claims for the years at issue in these Proceedings.

Response to Request No. 33: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is redundant of Request nos. 1, 19, and 24.

34. Produce all documents relating to any Claims on behalf of any MC Devotional Claimant that were filed or asserted by any entity other than MC, including any “independent claims” made by or on behalf of any MC Devotional Claimant for any year in these Proceedings.
35. Produce all cable and satellite royalty claims filed by any person or entity other than MC on behalf of any MC Devotional Claimant in these Proceedings.
36. Produce all documents and communications relating to the claims filed by All Global Media, LLC on behalf of Jack Van Impe Ministries in these Proceedings.
37. Produce all agreements and communications between and among You and All Global Media, LLC relating to filing Claims in these Proceedings.
38. Produce all documents relating to All Global Media, LLC’s Authority to file Claims on behalf of Jack Van Impe Ministries.
39. Produce all documents relating to Your legal structure, ownership and control.
40. Produce documents sufficient to identify all of Your owners, officers, principals, shareholders, and agents for the purposes of pursuing Claims in these Proceedings.
41. Produce documents sufficient to identify all of Your past and current assumed names, fictitious names, owners, principals, shareholders, agents, assignees, predecessors-in-interest, successors-in-interest, parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates, including, but not limited to, WSG, IPG, Spanish Language Producers, Ryan Galaz, Alfred Galaz, Raul Galaz, Ruth Galaz, and Denise Vernon, or any other applicable fictitious names, alteregos, pseudonyms, monikers, or trade names.

Response to Request No. 41: MC objects to the request, in part, on the grounds that such request is irrelevant, to the extent that it requests documents regarding “past . . . assumed names . . .” MC objects to the request to the extent that such documents are already in the possession of the SDC, or a matter of public record.

42. Produce all agreements, as well as all communications and documents relating to the terms, duration, and possible changes to such agreements, between MC and any of its affiliates, principals, shareholders, agents, alter-egos, predecessors, or owners, including Ryan Galaz, Raul Galaz, Alfred Galaz, Ruth Galaz, Denise Vernon, Spanish Language Producers, IPG, and/or WSG.

Response to Request No. 42: MC objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant as beyond the scope of the discovery required by the January 10, 2022 order relating to “claims issues”. MC further objects to the request on the grounds that such request is irrelevant to the extent that it seeks agreements with persons that are

neither claimants nor participants in these proceedings, nor predecessors in interest, including Ryan Galaz, Alfred Galaz, Raul Galaz, Ruth Galaz, or Denise Vernon.

43. If any documents produced in these Proceedings were created or signed on a date that is not apparent on the face of the document or that is different from the effective date reflected in the document, identify the date any such documents were actually created and/or signed, and produce all documents and communications reflecting or relating to the creation and transmission of such documents.
44. Produce all documents and information produced and all responses provided to any other participant in these Proceedings.

Subject to said objections, after making a diligent search of documents in its possession, MC produces herewith all documents responsive to these requests, pursuant to and protected by the terms of the Protective Order in place in this proceeding. Production shall be delivered via a Google Drive file emailed directly from MC.

Sincerely,

/s/

Brian Boydston, Esq.

Counsel for Multigroup Claimants

Proof of Delivery

I hereby certify that on Monday, March 14, 2022, I provided a true and correct copy of the SDC Motion to Compel MC to Produce Documents to the following:

Program Suppliers, represented by Lucy H Plovnick, served via ESERVICE at lhp@msk.com

Multigroup Claimants, represented by Brian D Boydston, served via ESERVICE at brianb@ix.netcom.com

Joint Sports Claimants, represented by Michael E Kientzle, served via ESERVICE at michael.kientzle@arnoldporter.com

SESAC Performing Rights, LLC, represented by John C. Beiter, served via ESERVICE at john@beiterlaw.com

Broadcaster Claimants Group, represented by John Stewart, served via ESERVICE at jstewart@crowell.com

American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), represented by Sam Mosenkis, served via ESERVICE at smosenkis@ascap.com

Broadcast Music, Inc., represented by Jennifer T. Criss, served via ESERVICE at jennifer.criss@dbr.com

Major League Soccer, L.L.C., represented by Edward S. Hammerman, served via ESERVICE at ted@copyrightroyalties.com

Global Music Rights, LLC, represented by Scott A Zebrak, served via ESERVICE at scott@oandzlaw.com

Signed: /s/ Michael A Warley